

Attleboro Public Schools  
Attleboro, Massachusetts  
School Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 21, 2011 @ 7:00 p.m.  
School Committee Conference Room - Attleboro High School  
Minutes

Present: Raymond DiCiaccio (At Large), Chairman; Melissa Cook (Ward I), Vice-Chairperson; Bob Hill (Ward III), Frances Zito (Ward V); Michael Levinson (Ward VI), and Helen Johnson (At Large)

Absent: James Stors (Ward II), Brenda Furtado (Ward IV); and Teri Enegren (At Large)

Also Present: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent, Nancy Sprague, Director for Teaching & Learning Excellence, Marc Furtado, Business Manager, and Judy Nelson, Recording Secretary.

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Salute to the Flag**

**Notice of Electronic Recording**

**Community Update:**

School Sponsored Events: Student Representative, Taylor Beland updated the committee on the upcoming events (see attached Power Point presentation attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

**Consent Agenda:**

Vote to accept a donation in the amount of \$100.00 from Howie Levine to the Attleboro Evening Diploma Program for Attleboro High School. Motion was made to accept the donation in the amount of \$100.00 from Howie Levine to the Attleboro Evening Diploma Program for Attleboro High School: Discussion: None: Vote: 6-0. Motion passes.

Mr. DiCiaccio recognized and welcomed Mayor Dumas who was in attendance.

**New Business:**

Presentation to the Committee by the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendent's – Excellence Award: Emily Mayer and Brian Cox: Pia Durkin, Superintendent (Administration Report): Dr. Durkin introduced Emily Mayer and Brian Cox. She gave brief background. Emily is the treasurer of the Senior Class, and represents AHS Student Council on the local and regional SAC boards. Emily is a top student, and was honored with a College Board Excellence Award for her scores on the PSAT. She is on the AHS field hockey, basketball, and track teams, and is a field hockey captain. She loves math and science, and plans to go into the business field someday. Brian is the president of the AHS chapter of the National Honor Society. He has been a member of the AHS soccer team since freshman year. He is also a member of the Team Up and Project Unite clubs. Both last year and this he is the equipment coordinator for the School Day Games. Brian also participated in the Boys' State Leadership Conference last spring at Stonehill College. Dr. Durkin asked the students if there were anything they would change about their experience at Attleboro High School. Brian stated he would change the block scheduling. He felt this limited the classes a student is able to take. Brian felt the trimester which is being reviewed now would be the path to take. Emily noted she would like to see a student have the same guidance counselor for the four year period. This allows for better knowledge of the students. Dr. Durkin awarded the certificates and thanked the parents for attending this evening.

Full Day Kindergarten Report – Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent, Nancy Sprague, Director for Teaching and Learning Excellence (Administration Report): Dr. Durkin noted the proposal for full day kindergarten was a challenge as well as a directive from the committee to develop a plan that would actually afford, she explained afford was not being used in the economic sense, for all students. This committee has definitely appreciated the benefits of full day kindergarten. She noted full day kindergarten started in 2007. Dr. Durkin worked with Nancy Sprague and the elementary principals to work through a proposal that provides several options. This decision cannot be made easily. She noted the importance of laying out all the issues. Dr. Durkin noted

there was another report that was not included in the packet, but had been given to the committee several times. Dr. Durkin noted this was the May 6, 2011 Report (a copy of which is attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof). She noted this report contained a great deal of data that will not be repeated this evening. It is a companion document to the presentation this evening.

Dr. Durkin began with the benefits to providing full day kindergarten for all. She explained the importance of speaking to these benefits. She noted high need students demonstrate less risk in being retained in later grades and develop fewer literacy learning gaps by Grade 3. Grade 3 is a pivotal year for students. She acknowledged the number of students attending charter schools to access the full day kindergarten program would be reduced if Attleboro could offer this program. She noted 95% of parents surveyed indicated they were interested in enrolling their children for a free full day program. Dr. Durkin stated in comparing Attleboro to the other 11 DART districts, there is only one other district today who is not serving 100% of kindergarten students in full day programs. Attleboro is at 60% and Weymouth is at 44%. She explained in 2007 Attleboro had 9% of its kindergarten students in full day programs and seven (7) districts had 100% of their kindergarten students in full-day programs and continue to do so today. She noted these cities/towns are: Medford, Norwood, Peabody, Pittsfield, Stoughton, Westfield, and Woburn.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if we were comparing ourselves to the other DART districts because we were similar in scope and size. These are the same ten districts we have been referring to.

Dr. Durkin confirmed this noting as well as economic level, special education, and ELL students as well. Dr. Durkin noted when we look at the Kindergarten timeline. She noted our kindergarten has been deemed appropriate and compliant with the state regulations. She noted the discussion about moving the lottery up. She noted we originally said we would like to do that however the will to do that and the ability to do that she learning quickly from the principals as to why we could not move that up quickly. She noted Ms. Sprague would explain this more so. To be in the lottery you have to be able to register. Parents have to be informed very early. The registration takes about 25 minutes per parent at each school and is usually held eight to ten weeks prior to the lottery to allow all parents to be part of the lottery.

Dr. Durkin asked Ms. Sprague to outline the kindergarten lottery timeline. Ms. Sprague noted the orientation and registration process for Attleboro is widely advertised so that all parents are informed. Registration is held at each elementary school. She explained how important the advertising piece is. She explained each entering student and the parent/guardian meet with the school nurse and school clerk for about 20 minutes for a screening process. This would take a great deal of time for the clerks. The kindergarten registration is held 8 to 10 weeks prior to the Lottery. Once the steps are completed the Kindergarten Lottery would be held. When this was timed out, it was not possible to move the lottery to January this year. Ms. Sprague noted the goal was to have the Lottery in January. She noted with the advertising process, this would not be possible for this year.

Dr. Durkin noted this would have meant we would have had to start registration last week in order to allow for that. She stated this was for this year. Dr. Durkin noted she does hear parents telling us that they want to know this earlier. She explained this year we will have to stick with what we are doing, but next year it should be part of our calendar and next year on October 1<sup>st</sup> we start the registration process. This could be done. We got out of the gate too late. She understands that parents want to know where their child will be. This involves a lot for example: deposits, etc.

She explained the lottery procedure and noted that the letters were mailed out after the Lottery. It is held by school. It is held here. She explained the people involved. It had been a confidential process in that all letters were mailed on the same day, the Friday after the Lottery is held. She explained the reasoning behind this process. Dr. Durkin stated the sub-committee had discussed a more public process. This could also be reviewed. It was suggested to post the names on the website. She has not checked this out legally. The timeline would have to be kept, but we could discuss the process and what the committee would like to do in terms of changes to this. Dr. Durkin explained the process in Boston. This seems labor intensive and is why Attleboro does it by school, but we could discuss this.

Ms. Sprague noted this discussion originated from the Policy Subcommittee. The discussion of what that lottery will look like will continue in the policy subcommittee.

Dr. Durkin noted using September 1 data that just passed. How many teachers and classrooms would be required to implement full-day kindergarten? This would involve approximately 435 kids. It would be two full day and two half day. That is what exists now. Slide six shows the number of teachers and classrooms that would be needed. She noted if we did provide full day kindergarten, we would be alright with space at this point in time. We have 435 students currently. However we do not know if we

offered full day for all how many more would register in Attleboro for example students that might be attending private and/or charter schools at this time to be able to have full day kindergarten at this time. The schools attending report gives us by grade where kids are attending other than public schools. She explained at this time in looking at this information there are currently 85 students who are in other schools for full day kindergarten.

Ms. Cook stated we are okay for classrooms now. Do we know how close we are to maxing out?

Mr. Furtado noted if more students were involved, we would need to find two more classrooms. This would be a challenge.

Ms. Sprague noted it would depend on which school they would come into.

Dr. Durkin noted offering full day kindergarten for all, she dealt with this in Boston, kids enter at all times. There is no cutoff date. If we did open this for all, we would have to consider the rolling admission type of process.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted limit on class size.

Ms. Sprague noted the limit is 28 for kindergarten.

Dr. Durkin noted classes this size is not a great idea. She noted we have worked hard to keep our class sizes, particularly in kindergarten, below 28.

Ms. Sprague explained in looking at the data, what would happen in first grade, do we get a lot of students who did not attend kindergarten in Attleboro. In looking at data, we did not see a lot of students entering who had not attended kindergarten in Attleboro. The numbers came out the same.

Dr. Durkin noted we do not have large attrition numbers. She noted the recurring costs. Classroom spaces are tight, but available. We would need 3.5 classroom teachers at approximately \$50,000. We would need special subject teachers (art, music, physical education, and computer teachers) with the benefits of 6.5 teachers at 30% would be approximately \$97,500 (see slide 8).

Mrs. Sprague noted every student receives five special subjects in a week: art, music, physical education, technology in terms of computers, and library. There are five schools that must distribute five specials equally, among all the classes; it becomes a challenge to do that schedule. Last year there were some challenges. This year we worked hard to make sure we had enough special teachers so that every student received every special. We added a music teacher so that every elementary had a library paraprofessional and a music teacher. The other specials service multiple schools. When we reviewed increasing the number of kindergarten classrooms and the number of specials that would be needed, we wanted to be sure that every kindergarten student received every special subject.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if all teachers at all schools are being used to their capacity.

Ms. Sprague noted when you are trying to schedule specials for five buildings, it is impossible to have the schedule fit 100% of the time. She explained the process giving the example that at Hill-Roberts perhaps the art teacher would have one period a week when they are not teaching art. That person would do an integration lesson during that period so that it is merging art and literature. Another example would be a computer teacher who is not scheduled in as computer class; those teachers would do accelerated reading. The student would read the book and do an online assessment. Their schedule is full, they have one planning period per day, not every class they teach is for example an art class, but is art related in another way. She noted for example in some of the schools they added a chorus because they had a block of time that allowed for this.

Dr. Durkin noted we are not under-scheduled. We also have to allow for the teacher to go between buildings if that is what their schedule calls for. This is a contractual agreement where the teacher is given a specific amount of time. The literacy block is 90 minutes and the math block is 60 minutes.

Ms. Sprague noted there was a question about FTEs. She explained the reasoning behind the numbers. Ms. Sprague explained the different roles a music teacher might provide. For example there is a music teacher who is doing second steps. They were trained in this program. We are fortunate to have a trained adult to provide this to the students who require this intense attention.

Dr. Durkin noted she does not know the specifics of all the school schedules. The principals verify this information and manage this information. We are not under scheduling and we are using our staff to the max as best we can and kids are getting interventions in the process.

Mr. Hill thanked the superintendent for the answer. He did not agree with the conclusions, but did not want that to distract from proposal and moving forward. However, he would like to be continued at a different time. Mr. Hill stated he did see some under scheduling and would like to continue this at another time. He noted the big detriment he sees to the proposal is the need for more specialists. Mr. Hill looked to see if we could save money with the specialists, asked for schedules from different people, and he sees something, but does not want this to distract from where we are going. He noted Malcolm Gladwell does a good way of describing the difference between a mystery and a puzzle, mystery is there just aren't any answers to it, and a puzzle is that you just don't have the information you need. Most of the stuff here is puzzles and we just need the information. It is just a matter of getting the information. Thank you for the information that has been provided so far.

Dr. Durkin welcomed Mr. Hill to come in and have Ms. Sprague set out the five schedules and we will be happy to go over that.

Mr. Hill noted he had several schools. He noted in one school the music teacher does not teach on Fridays. There are a lot of things we can look at. We have an unscheduled teacher and that is five periods. There are things we can look at. He again noted he disagreed with the conclusion and would definitely like to come in and look at the schedules.

Dr. Durkin welcomed that and noted this would help get to a bridge of understanding.

Mr. Furtado went over the transportation costs. We currently had a midday run that brings home the morning kindergarten students and picking up the afternoon students. The morning kindergarten students come in on a regular scheduled bus. The afternoon students go home on a bus. If you disperse those students into the regular bus routes, we might potentially need to add a bus, but would relieve the cost of the midday run. The net of that math is about \$35,000. This does not include any migration costs that might be incurred. He noted 85 additional students would call for two more buses which would be 55,000 to 65,000 per year.

Dr. Durkin noted the bus would be 60,000 offset by 25,000 that you would not need for midday runs equals about a \$35,000 increase. She explained the set up costs of the classroom estimating approximately \$35,000/classroom. The summary of projected expenses would total out at \$542,500. This is a conservative figure given the possible migration costs.

In reviewing ongoing admissions, currently we have a 143 half-day students. She noted the considerations that must be included. Dr. Durkin stated the program options. She noted they began with three options and added a fourth to include tuition.

Option A: full day kindergarten for all students which would include transportation for all students.

Option B: full day kindergarten for all students; half-day option at one school; transportation to that one school; if less than 15 students opt for a half-day kindergarten program.

Option C: full day kindergarten required for all students; half-day attendance is permitted at individual schools by leaving the full day program at noon; no transportation will be provided for the half day leaving at noon.

Option D: Charge Tuition: half day offered (see slide 14); Ms. Sprague will review this. She noted this was part of the document that was provided on May 6<sup>th</sup> last year (a copy of which is attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

Mr. Levinson noted in May when this was presented to the curriculum subcommittee, he noted even if we offered full-day, we had to have the option of half-day. He thought there was a state regulation that required this.

Dr. Durkin clarified, if it is being offered free, this is not required. She noted there might be community concerns that we do not have that option.

Mr. Levinson noted the regulation provides for free full day without the half day option.

Dr. Durkin noted she would have to confirm. She noted if we did say full day for all, are there really families who feel strongly that we offer a half day option. Dr. Durkin stated this is why this was outlined the way it is for whatever reasons. She noted there is more to look at, but at least this is the beginning part. She asked Ms. Sprague to outline the tuition aspect.

Ms. Sprague noted this came directly from the May 6<sup>th</sup> Superintendent's Report to the School Committee.

Mr. Hill asked for clarification of sub-committee or school committee.

Dr. Durkin noted this was presented to the School Committee.

Mr. Levinson noted the sub-committee presentation was held in April. He noted this was presented to the sub-committee first and then to full committee.

Dr. Durkin confirmed that.

Ms. Sprague noted this estimates the enrollment at 400. She noted if we charge tuition, we absolutely have to offer the half-day. We cannot force a parent to pay for the kindergarten option. The estimate is that 400 students would attend the full day program. You would need to subtract from that the free and reduced lunch student who would not be charged tuition. This would leave approximately 260 tuition eligible students. The different possible fees were reviewed. She broke down the revenue: @ 2,000 = \$520,000 = (-\$70,000); @ 3,000 = \$780,000 = +190,000; @ 4,000 = 1,040,000 = +450,000. These figures do not include if we needed to add additional students which would then require we add a class and a teacher. The other question was what impact would this have on Chapter 70, state aid money if the district was making a profit on the full-day kindergarten tuition. Ms. Sprague noted this is not something the administration supports in charging students to attend full-day kindergarten because we believe this is a critical piece for a child's education to have access to that kindergarten program whether or not a parent can afford to pay the tuition.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if the other communities that were reviewed in the DART, do they charge tuition.

Dr. Durkin stated it was all free.

Mr. Hill stated just because you say not being in support of it; you say it is a crucial piece. Mr. Hill noted he totally and wholeheartedly agreed. That is why he might consider the fee option. He stated as a parent who is going to have a child in kindergarten, noting, he was glad he was not going to be on the committee because it might be a conflict of interest. He noted he was going to be paying this amount of money regardless. It will either be paid to the Attleboro Public Schools or it will be paid to a daycare provider. When he pays the money to the Attleboro Public Schools, it will not just pay for his son, it will pay for a whole bunch of kids who cannot afford to pay for kindergarten. Mr. Hill sees this a bit differently when you say it is a critical piece and everyone deserves it. He agrees wholeheartedly, but by offering tuition you actually afford the people who cannot; more opportunity to do it. The money is going to be spent regardless. He stated one of the issues he looks at now is what do you do when your child comes home at noon. They go in for 2 ½ hours of school. That is not a lot of time. There are working parents that have daycare needs and \$2,000 is a bargain. The nice thing is that it is going to provide for a lot of people who cannot do it. He believes it is something that this committee will not decide. It is something the next committee needs to look at very carefully because it is an equity issue. It absolutely is an equity issue. He noted by charging tuition, you actually meet the equity issue which is a totally different way to look at it as it has been looked at so far.

Mr. Levinson noted, he did not believe he was at the sub-committee meeting when it was presented back in April. One issue that was brought up with the principals, how does it practically get taken care of? Mr. Levinson noted it was envisioned that we might become like a collection agency. For example would it be done in installments and a family makes the first few installments and then does not pay because of a financial burden. How does this get handled is the child put into a half-day program, do we send them to a collection agency, how would this be handled? This is an area the sub-committee saw problems with. He did note there are communities that are currently handling this for example: Dighton Rehoboth. This is their first year of implementation. Perhaps they might be a good community to talk with.

Mr. Hill noted this was a good point. He stated he looked at some private schools. Mr. Hill stated some of the private schools he looked at use Sallie Mae for tuition collection. It is a third party and could be built into the expenses. He noted if you charged for instance \$3,000 and the district had a \$190,000 excess, it would certainly pay for any third party fee incurred. Mr. Hill stated if you follow the model colleges would use, with regard to payment plans; payment plans start in July. By the September start date,

there are already three months paid in. You would be aware by this time who is and who is not going to be able to make their payments. There are ways to put safety nets in place. One being turning it over to a third party who is going to be responsible for payments, they make their profit and guarantee that money. A second would be kind of frontloading it. He noted this will be something that the next committee will tackle.

Dr. Durkin stated who stands at the door when someone cannot pay.

Mr. Hill stated that is a good question. As it was stated there is a half-day program that would be available. He noted no one would ever say to a child because it is not legally allowed, that they could not attend public school. There would always be a half day option.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted Mr. Hill brought up a good point, it does enable us. It would be wonderful if we did not have to deal with that at all as that would be the ideal scenario. He noted with any decision that is made, there is a can of worms that kind of gets opened. He noted entities such as Sallie Mae exist and other third parties that do run well. It would take the management function off of our shoulders. He noted this was something he was concerned about and that was the reason it was brought up before. These third parties are in the business of doing that function and do it well.

Dr. Durkin stated one of the things she was fortunate to talk with the Mayor about last week was the fiscal pressure points when we look at the amount of money we want to be able to have for free full day kindergarten. When Ms. Sprague noted the administration is in support of free full day kindergarten, is a philosophical issue and is very much a developmental issue to serve all families. It is public education and is a critical part of a child's life. It also is a right not a privilege. It is not something extra. Kindergarten is school. In fact many communities are funding programs for four-year-olds, even three-year-olds out west. There are going to be different opinions and ultimately the committee will decide, but the families she has spoken to often and out in the community are very concerned about any tuition stipend that would occur.

Dr. Durkin addressed the pressure points. There is an 18-month lag which is the biggest one about when we would see an increase in our revenue foundation funding from the increased full-day kindergarten enrollment. The problem is that for next year we see no increase because if we begin full-day kindergarten, we will not see that increase our foundation budget until FY14. It is almost like you have to have a heavy duty mixture up to that point. In FY13, we would see it in FY15.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked the Superintendent to explain the foundation funding so that people understand.

Dr. Durkin deferred to the Business Manager, Marc Furtado.

Mr. Furtado noted the State of Massachusetts, Department of Education, has a foundation budget that is based on a significant number of demographic data for any community. Not limited to, but including the enrollment, ratio of state-defined poor manufacturing based tax revenue. There are a whole variety of components that drive the education formula. As a community sees its enrollment increase in a given fiscal year, whatever year it might be, that increased enrollment does not work its way through the foundation formula to get to the corresponding jump in state support or foundation budget until 18 months after the enrollment hits. He explained we take census in October and that drives all of those numbers. Whatever the census number is in October of any given fiscal year, that result will not work its way through the formula until 18 months later, and so you skip the fiscal year when you see any significant increase or decrease in enrollment. In this case, we would be talking about 150-200 students.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted, we take a census this fall, we have 6000 kids; that is what drives happens 18 months from now.

Mr. Furtado stated according to the state identifying the required spending for education in Attleboro.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if that meant half-day students are not recognized as part of the census.

Mr. Furtado explained that they are recognized as half.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted they are recognized as half.

Dr. Durkin stated we would gain between \$500,000 - 600,000; in the foundation budget if we did Full-Day Kindergarten for all students.

Mr. Furtado noted eventually the foundation budget catches up.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted the foundation budget would allow us to get there, but it would be a matter of what we do for those 18-months of the gap.

Dr. Durkin noted particularly in FY13 which is a discussion the Mayor and she had because we will not see it; it will come, but not for 18-months. The other pressure point is that we know this is a difficult time to create any new programs. There are no stimulus dollars coming down the pike. We are already experiencing class-size contractual grievances due to the realignment in last year's budget. Some students, who are coming in to one school, need to be placed in another because, as noted, 28 is the limit.

We also have, even though our bargaining units worked with us, very closely to not have across the board increases, the budget needs to have a million dollars in it for steps, lanes, and all those contractual obligations. We are experiencing grant erosion with an approximate reduction of \$150,000 across several grants. The Full-Day Kindergarten grant has been reduced by \$40,000. This year it was approximately \$117,000 which is down from \$157,000 last year. The staffing costs keep going up because teachers do move up on steps and lanes and the grant funding is going down. We have a significant issue with that. In FY11 it was reported that we had \$500,000 in unexpended funds and that was certified by the City Auditor in closing the books; this \$500,000 is being used to cover our expenses now. This was counted into our budget.

We have three contracts that are up for renewal. They are due in June of 2012: facilities; transportation; and food services. There is very little wiggle-room when it comes to transportation and food service contracts by state law. They do not yield any resources to assist us in APS programs. We had a possible understanding of a phase-in plan; this was something we felt was our obligation to put forward. In adding three (3) full-day classes in FY13; we would see the need for \$287,500. If we added two (2) more full-day classes in FY14, thereby bringing everyone whole to full-day kindergarten, we would need \$255,000.

Dr. Durkin asked Mayor Dumas to join and discuss how we are trying to work this through. Dr. Durkin noted she was delighted to meet with the Mayor fresh off his re-election and discuss the needs of the school system as we see ourselves going forward for not only this year, but the next two years. She thanked the Mayor for coming tonight to offer his insights to how we can work through this.

Mayor Dumas thanked the committee for allowing him to attend this evening. He noted as Dr. Durkin stated, they did sit down. Mayor Dumas noted this was not the first time they have sat down and talked about full-day kindergarten. Since she was asked by the committee to do an evaluation, something she periodically does and meets with him on many issues that affect our schools.

He noted certainly with the context of what we are dealing with nationally, not just here on a local level, looking at trying to get to that point where we can offer full-day kindergarten for every student in the Attleboro Public School system. We talked about the number of classes as we know it now, looking at the five (5) additional classes, and looking at the associated costs that come with them, if we broke it down in these two (2) ways, one for FY13 by adding the three (3) full-day classes, and FY14 adding of the additional two (2) classes thereafter. He stated that was our goal, and he stated goal because we will be starting the budgetary process in January, as is done annually. Certainly, it is our goal that we are able to take that first step forward in order to be able to add the additional classes onto what we currently have for full-day kindergarten. This is something he believes in; in sharing his thoughts with Dr. Durkin. He noted it will not be this current committee that is sitting here for the decisions that will be made for the next budgetary process. It will certainly be the process to realign, request, and reduce wherever possible in order to meet our goals and objectives for the fiscal year, but also trying to do the phase in plan. He certainly thinks is the way that gets us to the road that will give us the opportunity for full-day kindergarten for everyone.

When we look at it, we all want more things all of the time. He noted with regard to his goals for the city, they also go through the same type of process for budgetary phase-ins. We look at different types of opportunities. He noted in dealing with the classrooms and instruction, you cannot do the same kind of things the city might do, like trying to hire staff mid-year and things of that kind of nature. We would look at the dollar amount that would be needed to get the full-time kindergarten and be able to take this in a phase-in approach; we are already in the first phase in the approach and these are the last two steps needed to be able to guarantee for all the students in the City of Attleboro who wish to be able to take full-day kindergarten, that within a 24 month period, we will be able to obtain that goal. This is a goal for the City and a goal for the School Committee as well.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if the Mayor was suggesting that this was something that he, as Mayor, was planning to propose to City Council in this coming budget. That Phase I be considered by the Council, as this ultimately has to be approved by the Council.

Mayor Dumas explained all expenses; City and/or Schools are approved by the City Council. It is all part of one budget for the 105 Million that we operate under every day. We will need to work with the staff and Dr. Durkin to create a budget in order to try to obtain this goal. He stated the procedure used by the City to identify areas where they might be able to save money and be able to reduce and realign before we go they would ask for additional funding. This is done yearly as well as monthly tracking of the revenues and expenses. This is a goal for us for the City that he would like to be able to pursue for FY13 as we move forward together.

Dr. Durkin stated that was incredibly generous of the Mayor to give his endorsement because this cannot be done alone. She noted if we cannot get over this "hump" we could make a lot of children and families happy to move this forward.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted as a City this shows the importance of our education. It is important and he appreciated the fact that this would be an important goal. Mr. DiCiaccio thanked the Mayor.

Dr. Durkin asked if there were any more questions on this report. She noted this would be the first of many. Hopefully this gave the Committee a broad picture of where we are and what we need.

Mr. Hill stated when we say where we are going. There are four options out there. The Mayor stated this is one he is interested in doing, so are the other three options still on the table. Mr. Hill stated he would assume the process will be that the Committee sets the goals. He noted it would be nice to add the three additional classes, but it still falls short of full-day kindergarten for all students. Before we would move forward, he believed it would be worth looking at the other options that are out there. For example reduce and realign. There are 2.0 specialists in the first year; that he would like to see them chip away at. It is very feasible. Mr. Hill hopes that the new committee members are taking notes and that we can move from a committee approved plan to being implemented and approved.

Middle School Whole School Improvement Plans 2011-12: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent - Brennan, Coelho, Wamsutta – Karen Saltzman, Reza Sarkarati, Karol Coffin (Administration Report): Dr. Durkin invited the principals to come forward. She explained the streamlining of the Whole School Improvement Plans. This evening the principals will explain some high points. In ELA we are talking about expanding writing. We will focus on Math and our achievement gap. Two areas that have not been discussed before as part of the Whole School Improvement Plan are the Grade 4 to 5 Transition Plan that was discussed in the beginning of the year as part of our goals to have better achievement at the Middle Schools and the necessity for that and Science. She turned it over to Ms. Sprague for an overarching piece and then the principals will present.

Ms. Sprague noted the Whole School Improvement Plans start with a foundation of the district goals for improvement and then each principal work with the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) which includes teachers and their School Councils which has community and parent representation. They look at the district goals, data from the school perspective and the goals and objectives are devised for the next year. The plans have similarities because of the district goals, but they also have unique characteristics based on the needs of the individual schools. The four sections will be highlighted this evening.

Mr. Sarkarati noted one area that all three schools are focusing on is to improve writing. The district uses a trait-based approach to writing. There are six traits: ideas, organization, voice, word choice, fluencies and conventions. Each month teachers focus on a particular trait of writing. These traits are taught, reviewed, and feedback is provided to the students as they put these six traits together. One of the practices used over the years and continues is "calibrating scoring". Teachers review writing to come up with common feedback that explains the strengths and weaknesses of a piece. This was done by the administrators recently with the coaches at both the elementary and middle school level. Students are working with analyzing papers to determine what the strengths are and how to improve those pieces. Teachers are doing more work to model their own writing. The teacher provides a prompt and a question. The teacher then does the writing. A student is then able to see what high quality writing looks like and the thought process the teacher used to write that piece. We are encouraging mentor text. A mentor text is anything that is an authentic piece from an expert or from a "real" piece of literature. Students are able to see things that they are practicing and learning about and how they are used in published works. Some of the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers have participated in Advanced Placement activities, gone through training, and are spreading those practices. An example of these strategies: reciprocal teaching or dialectical journals. In December the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers will begin to visit teachers visit Brennan, then Wamsutta, and then Coelho to view the practices in action and raise the rigor in the classes. To be more consistent with the elementary school and to employ a success process, our teachers are trained in the Empowering Writer's Program in Grades 5,



6, and 7 using the narrative approach. Parents and students at home might be familiar with the writing dialogue. This has come to the middle schools and our teachers have been training in repository writing. This is for writing in the content areas and is informational writing. The type of writing that would normally happen in a Science or Social Studies class. There is professional development going on in this area. Teachers have been working with feedback; referred to as growth producing feedback. This either affirms what a student is doing or gives clear feedback on what a child needs to do to improve the writing process. Conference time with students has been increased and is showing great feedback. The last item is peer observation and connecting teachers with other teachers to learn good practices and share great ideas. The 5<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers have visited the elementary schools and as mentioned before other teachers are in the process of the same.

Ms. Saltzman discussed mathematics noting between the three middle schools there are overarching goals. They all have percentages within our goals that are looking to increase the numbers of students reaching proficiency; either getting into proficiency or advanced levels. This is by moving students out of the needs improvement area. We have percentages where we are looking to narrow the achievement gaps for our subgroups of students specifically: low income, limited English Proficiency, and our special education subgroups. There are many common actions steps. We are all using Test Wiz to assist our efforts with analyzing the MCAS and common assessment data. This is the second year of using the math common assessments. The baseline assessment was given to all Grades 5-8 in September; and we anxiously await the December results. In the baseline in September, we did not expect that students would be at 100% proficient because this test is based on the grade level standards that students are expected to meet by the end of the school year. We expect good growth when we assessment is done in December. This data is used during common planning times when grade level teams meet to discuss target interventions. We would review and identify weaknesses at certain grade levels and decisions are made on how to move forward. These meetings include: principals, assistant principals, coaches, and teachers.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if we were using data differently than last year. We have talked about the refining process.

Ms. Saltzman noted we are now better equipped to look at the data to narrow it down to particular focus areas. Teachers are now independently able to break down the data and work with it.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if were getting to the level where this data is being used to identify particular students. For example: on an individual basis to identify where a particular need would be.

Ms. Saltzman confirmed this. We review the whole grade level aggregate of students. It is broken down by individual subgroups and individual students. The teachers really get into this piece as they want to assure success for all of their students.

Dr. Durkin noted we are looking at standards for example: when we review the math performance we can see how come our 6<sup>th</sup> Grade students did so poorly in Geometry. The data shows which answers they picked and what percentage picked that answer. That might have been a conceptual interpretation. This allows us to identify the specific areas students need help in to ensure they are receiving the intervention needed to allow for success the next time. This can be reviewed historically as well. She noted you can be data rich and information poor. We have really tried to review the data to fine tune it to ensure we are looking at the pieces that matter the most. The District Data Accountability Team which is part of the Superintendent's Goals will assist in this area to identify the critical pieces.

Ms. Saltzman noted the interventions are then planned. In two of the schools we have extended two periods to 75 minutes to allow for targeted interventions on particular days. We also use what is called "PLC times" that are power ups and power hours that happen two times per week when these interventions are worked on. There are many ways this is handled: inclusion groups, specialists, etc. Teachers are collecting formative assessments daily at the end of their lessons during their closure; getting information back from the student as to what was learned that day as it helps to plan for the next day. Another common feature in the plans is to increase the quality of the Math Open Response questions and also the responses the students are providing. A lot of work and focus is being done in this regard. We are having the teachers do modeling work, have the student answer independently, and providing good growth producing feedback. This allows the student to identify where they need to focus and grow. There are math reasoning books. These were tested at Brennan last year in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade. This is now used throughout. They are being piloted by a teacher at every grade level in Coelho this year. These books are similar to a writing journal. This allows the student to work with a concept and/or problem more thoroughly to explain how they answered the problem. This allows the student to write more and think at a deeper level. The teachers are modeling and the Math Coach is working with teachers to model as well. The teacher cannot just instruct, they need to provide a discussion period for students and then apply what they learn. Math coaches assist in the process and help assist in the strategy approaches. Students are asked to get feedback as to how they are doing and start to set goals for themselves. For example: where they want to improve

and how they want to improve in the areas of math. When they receive the next set of work back; where they want to reflect and how to set a goal to improve. It is a process to have students be self-reflectors and accountable more so for their learning.

Ms. Cook noted she has been listening to these for several years. She noted you always see a flow and noted the appreciation of new things. What of those new things do you feel will have the greatest impact or what is most important to you and your staff.

Ms. Coffin noted one of the things that really helped to move the staff along is the ability to look at data and to take the data drill down with that data. We have moved through a progression where three years ago, we would look at that MCAS information, try to decipher it, and talk about it. Two years ago we looked at the MCAS information and we were able to start taking it apart in labels. This was done to some extent the year before, but not to the detail we were able to. We started to match this with student intervention. This allowed us to identify a group of students who might be weak in a certain area. We now know the special ed strategies, the ELL strategies, the basic learning strategies that will help that group of students learn that particular skill. We have all looked at our schedules. We have redesigned our schedules to allow for time to do this. In this past year, we saw a tremendous increase in the staff ability to do data work on their own. In addition to that work, the collection of formative data on a daily to weekly basis. They are coupling summative the big data for example: MCAS with the formative which is today one could look at one skill and identify that a student might need this. Their ability to take that data and turn it around and infuse it into the lesson the next day is really what is starting to drive the improvement of the student. This is one of the most exciting pieces. Through the professional development we have learned some wonderful strategies to work with the students in specific areas. Now we are able to take the testing piece and the strategy piece and put them together, put it into a lesson, and really make it effective for these children.

Ms. Coffin noted in looking at that data, we have realized that we have been looking at the transition from Grade 8 to Grade 9 for quite a while. In the years she has been here, she has gone to a meeting once a month on that topic. That data has shown us that we are not doing an effective transition from Grades 4 to 5. This year we have all included in our School Improvement Plan a transition from four to five which is also reflected in our work with the elementary principals. We are now meeting with them as well. The district as a whole in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade is not at the level of proficient and advanced as the state in both Science/Technology and in ELA. We are even in Math; however, we do not feel comfortable with even that level. We need to make our 5<sup>th</sup> Graders become more comfortable in middle school, but the bigger piece of it is for them to become more academically success then they have been in the past. Last year we visited the elementary schools and have continued this at a more aggressive pace. The administrators and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers have visited the elementary schools. We are looking at what are the differences in the expectation level between a 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade teacher. We are looking at the social aspect of it, the delivery of it, the independence of the learning, and we now have the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers coming to the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade to look at what this looks like at the middle school level. Feedback is given. We are looking at what is happening in the classrooms, what types of assessments are given, and the support at each level. We want to bring these pieces together similar to what has been done between the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Grades. The transition goal in our plans is a new one from Grades 4 to Grades 5. We are excited about this. We have already gleaned some insights into things we need to be looking at. This is a yearlong process. By the spring we will have a solid plan that we will be able to implement with our fourth graders coming into fifth grade that will carry into the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade as well.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked for an example of something that has been gleaned to this point.

Ms. Coffin noted this is something that is simple and very obvious, but it isn't until you are sitting in the classroom. Fourth Graders are the oldest ones in the school. They are regarded as older children by the elementary folks. When they come to middle school how do we see them? They are the youngest one in the school. Do we have a different expectation level? The fourth grade teacher sees them as older and we see them doing tremendous independent work in the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade. They come to the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade and we are not seeing the amount of independent work and why is that? One of the other pieces of work was walking into the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade; we forgot how much they move around. In 5<sup>th</sup> Grade they do not move around like that. But is that something that is more conducive to their learning? They are able to do stations. Students in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade are able to move around independently from station to station which means they are physically moving. In 5<sup>th</sup> Grade they sit for a period of time and may use stations, but not quite as often. They do not do some of the movement that they are accustomed to in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade. How do we look at building sustainability in 4<sup>th</sup> Graders to be ready for 5<sup>th</sup> Grade? At the same time how do we look at allowing our 5<sup>th</sup> Graders to have more movement in the process which appears to be something they need in the learning process.

Dr. Durkin noted she was speaking with a 4<sup>th</sup> Grade teacher who went over to a 5<sup>th</sup> Grade class. She told her 5<sup>th</sup> Grade colleague, they were friends; "I gave directions once". You gave the directions four times. They did not listen to you the first three times; do it once, get the focus, and move on. They are used to hearing directions once; why are we saying them three and

four times? There are different types of styles. Ms. Coffin framed it well. They are the youngest in the middle school, but the oldest in elementary. What are our expectations? This kind of sharing allows people to see what it looks like at the different levels and build from there.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted he could relate to the Grade 8 to Grade 9 transition as he has seen this over the years with his children, but from a curriculum standpoint are we identifying the holes in the curriculum. Where maybe we are not "passing the baton" on in Math, English, or Science? At one point that did exist from the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade to the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade. There was a lot of work done and this is much better now.

Ms. Sprague noted one thing that was interesting in looking at the student writing. When you looked at the fourth grade and what the students were able to write. When we looked at the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade we were not seeing in all cases that carryover. She would not say there are gaps in the curriculum. The standards flow and we are using Reading Street right from four to five. Every Day Math goes right across. She believes it has a lot to do with expectations. We did not give the teachers the opportunity to share across. What are the students able to do in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade so when you come in, you should start here. Instead being the youngest, we might go back here a bit, we do not need to go back; we need to be exactly where they were when they left. Having teachers compare work. This will make a big difference. Ms. Sprague reiterated, there are not holes in the curriculum in content, it is the expectations. It is what kind of work are we seeing the students do in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade for example: going independently around stations, writing a three page piece, and what kind of work are we expecting in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade. We do not need to back up, we need to move forward.

Ms. Coffin noted the other new area in the WSIP for the middle schools is Science and Technology. This is a particularly challenging area for us because Science and Technology is tested in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade and tested again in 8<sup>th</sup> Grade. Students have to have multiple years of knowledge in order to take this test. Again as a district we are below the state in Science and Technology both in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade. We have had a science curriculum, however, when it comes to having students prepared to take their MCAS, we need to review everything that comes two years prior to that test. This needs to be matched up with what is being taught in the present year. This is referred to as spirally in education. It is not that you need to completely teach it again, but there is a need to spiral back to make sure students remember and have an opportunity to recall that information again. The curriculum is being reviewed. We are looking at the pacing. We are looking at, we do not have the common assessments developed in science; the way we have them developed in ELA and Math at this time. The district common assessments have been good indicators for us with regard to student progress. At each of the schools there are different types of assessments that are being tried with the sciences. As we go through this year and review the curriculum, we will review the assessments. We are discussing the need to develop something. This referred to as the standards focus areas because these are the science standards are students need to know. We are reviewing that and looking at how to infuse the weak standards because, again, this comes down to looking at our data. When we look at the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade test, we need to pick out which of those strands apply to which grade level when it was taught and that teacher informs the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers where the weak areas are and work on those strands. Science and technology is something are students absolutely must have. We are working very hard to improve that through improving the lessons and the identification of the standards; and all the areas we need to do for Science and Technology.

Dr. Durkin noted the Whole School Improvement Plans are public documents and we monitor fairly closely how well we are achieving them. They are part of the principal's SMART Goals and a lot of the coaching and supervision work the superintendent does with them. We are ambitious. We are trying to get them better and more streamlined. Each year we keep doing this. Dr. Durkin thanked the principals.

Mr. DiCiaccio thanked the principals for being upfront with the problem areas and identifying this as it ties into making the district better.

Update on Elementary School Schedule: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent (Administration Report): Dr. Durkin noted the next update was on the elementary school schedule that she was asked to get feedback on from families. She attended four out of the five PTO meetings over the past few weeks. This was part of her standard means of reaching out to parents. We had this a part of our terms of discussion as to how the schedule was working and if not, why not. She gave a history of how the elementary schedule came to be. Dr. Durkin noted some people at home might not realize that we have had a number of changes over the last few years. We started with staggered times for the school day; as you know the elementary had early and late schools. We then changed to uniform start times, but adjusted the time a little bit earlier and a little bit later. We then worked on adding the 20 minutes to the instructional learning day. We waited a year because by the time this was negotiated with teachers, we had not had time to inform parents; therefore teachers were staying the additional 20 minutes, but students were not. We also found in

adjusting for those 20 minutes, we also needed to ensure that students were getting to school on time. We have learned that there has to be a minimum of 55 minutes between the middle school run and the elementary run for kids to be able to enter school, have their breakfast, and enter class. As opposed to getting there late, gobbling down breakfast, and beginning class.

No one likes to start work that way and no one likes to start their day that way. We adjusted the transportation times to utilize that.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted we are starting 55 minutes; the high school students will start arriving at 6:55; do we go 55 minutes from that time.

Mr. Furtado noted there are 27 buses. The 27 buses unload sometime between 6:55 and 7:10.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted then we plan 55 minutes off the 7:10.

Mr. Furtado confirmed this.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated that being middle school; and asked if that was how we arrived at the time of the start of school.

Dr. Durkin confirmed that. She noted we added ten minutes to the beginning of the day and ten minutes to the end of the day in terms of how do we adjust for those 20 minutes. A couple of items: families felt the transportation issues, again she visited four PTOs. She noted one had about 15 parents. Most were between 20 and 30 parents. The issue was not transportation. Kids are being picked up on time. She noted the first few weeks of schools, the kinks were worked through. There were no outstanding issues of parents still waiting for transportation for their children. She attributed that to a lot of the work the Business Manager has done in terms of ensuring we had those 55 minutes in between. If we cut that closer and started school earlier, we would be back to what was described before as to students arriving late to school. The buses are at 90% capacity. She noted we want to spend our money on books and teachers things the students use rather than buses. We have realigned transportation to have fewer buses, but they are full; which means longer bus rides. State law says bus rides can run up to one hour. To be on a bus for an hour is a long time; but is within compliance. Is it the best thing, no, but some parents did note their children were on buses for longer periods of time and it does get darker earlier. There is a problem with that. The piece she heard a little bit about was the fact that they get home later and there is: soccer; CCD, or some other activity. This is a challenge. She did state that we spent a year of letting people know this was going to occur and when it would occur. We let our afterschool agents know this; for example the area YMCA. The YMCA worked with us. We cannot be responsible for those schedules. These places have adjusted their schedules. Some students get off the bus at 3:15 and perhaps 3:30 they are at CCD or at another activity. By enlarge; she believed she heard families pleased that the transportation issues were not significant. There was discussion about the 10 minutes early and the 10 minutes late. We do need that 20 minutes of instructional time and now the time allocation for all of our schools is the same. All schools are 7 hours and 10 minutes. We did not have that previously. There were different contractual guidelines. Parents did ask if was going to change again. She did not believe it would as it was not in our foreseeable future. Dr. Durkin noted in the last three years, it has changed three times; that is a lot. We went from 8:25 to 2:50; then 8:40 to 3:00; and now 8:50 to 3:30 because of the changes she discussed.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted if he understood this correctly, there really is no wiggle room because of the 55 minutes to allow for transportation.

Dr. Durkin noted we did attempt that and students were arriving late.

Mr. Furtado noted it trickles back to how early do we want the high school to be in?

Dr. Durkin did float the idea of switching the high school and elementary schools. She heard parents note their older students need to be there to care for the younger siblings. There are a lot of other pressures on families in terms of that, as well as jobs, as well as other things. Dr. Durkin noted she had one more school to attend, but is open to hear from families. She noted by enlarge she didn't hear a lot of issues. There were a few parents who wanted to go back to an earlier day. A couple of families noted they have cut their childcare costs because the student arrives home later and the cost has decreased. The fact that they could spend time with their middle school student before their elementary child came home. People were looking at things in many different ways. When we deal with 6000 students and 3800 families, we know we will not be able to please everyone. The benefit is to make sure our students are in school and have a full instructional day.

Ms. Sprague noted we reviewed this. All the changes in elementary over the past few years can be frustrating.

Mr. Hill had a transportation question. He asked if it were possible to have two different companies service the same district.

Mr. Furtado stated that was possible.

Mr. Hill asked if that were something we might consider as a way to solve the issue of the 55 minutes. To have one company service only the elementary or whatever variation would work.

Mr. Furtado noted what we might run in to is; if it were your business, you have a fixed cost investment in moving the students. The tiers are marginal costs. It is not equally divided between three tiers. To run one tier, you would get hit with a significant charge. If we are paying; again he was speculating, \$260/day for three tiers; one would pay \$190-200 for one tier. Mr. Furtado stated he believed you would end up paying more, although he has never done this before. If a company was just to take the elementary school students and asked another company to take these other two groups when we combine the costs of those two things; it would be more than a three tier system with the same company. He noted this was just his speculation. He noted we are disembarking 27 buses. Bus #1 is disembarking at a very different time than Bus #27. The pressure with split times at the elementary schools; the early buses served the early schools and the later buses served the later schools. This is where the time was backed up because this could not be done for all the schools.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if all 27 buses were out for each tier.

Mr. Furtado stated yes.

Dr. Durkin reminded the committee at 90% capacity.

Mr. Furtado noted at the elementary level there are five schools; each school would have five or six buses services that school. The middle school has three schools and each school would be serviced by 8 or 9 buses.

Mr. Hill asked if this was 90% on paper.

Mr. Furtado confirmed this. He stated it is similar to an airline business you would book 110% and hope that 90% show up.

Dr. Durkin stated we are not hearing what we used to; in that buses were going by half empty. The buses are full.

Personnel Report: Nancy Sprague, Director for Teaching and Learning Excellence (Administration Report): One retirement was reported (see the attached report attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

**Minutes:** Vote to approve the Minutes from 08-15-11: Motion was made to accept the Minutes from 08-15-11: Discussion: None: Vote: 5-0-1 (Johnson). Motion passes.

**Open Forum:** Mr. DiCiaccio explained the guidelines for Open Forum. There were no participants.

#### **Unfinished Business:**

Update to the Committee on the MSBA – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted there was nothing new to report at this time.

Update to the Committee on the Coelho Roof – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted there was nothing new to report at this time.

Update to the Committee on the X2 Implementation – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted there was nothing new to report at this time.

#### **Committee Reports**

##### **Finance, Facilities and Procurement Sub-Committee**

## Notification of bills and warrants

5BS018 – 11-09-11 - \$296,566.61

5BS016 – 11-16-11 - \$348,454.72

Ms. Cook reported on the meeting held on 11-16-11 (see the attached draft minutes attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof). All monthly budget reports were running well. The heating pipe repairs were finished and completed in 12 days, well under the expected time. The project incurred an \$8,000 expense due to the work that needed to be done during the 2<sup>nd</sup> shift as discussed previously.

Pay Phones: Ms. Cook noted that up until October, these phones were owned by Verizon and billed under a consolidated invoice on one of our accounts. By billing this way, we received benefits for these phones under E-Rate. Verizon has sold these phones to PTS (Pacific Tele-management Services). These phones will no longer be eligible for E-Rate reimbursements. The cost to us for these phones is about \$15,000.00 annually. The Subcommittee asked Mr. Furtado to find out where in the buildings the phones are located and how much use do these phones have. Ms. Cook asked Mr. Furtado if emergency phones are available like the ones on college campuses.

Efficiency Projects at the High School, Wamsutta, and Brennan: Ms. Cook explained that Mr. Furtado stated that in the past he has talked to the Subcommittee about efficiency projects at Studley and the High School. The return paid to us on these projects was less than three years. Our portion was paid with ARRA and City funds. There will be a three year return on the projects at Wamsutta and Brennan. Half of the cost of these projects will be covered by rebates and the other half will be covered by a 0% loan provided to the district over a 36 month period. Our cost will be added to the utility bill. We have done projects like this before and they are tangible.

Ms. Cook asked Mr. Furtado to give an explanation of the projects. Mr. Furtado explained that the heating systems were done with a concern for costs and run either on or off, which makes areas of the buildings either hot or cold. These projects would provide variable drives to control the temperatures between on and off. These projects would result in savings to the district and have a big impact on efficiency and energy usage. The High School project will allow maintenance of the system to be done via a computer from home. This cost would be covered by rebates and the remaining would be paid through the local budget. The charges for this project would be added onto the monthly bills and spread out over 36 months. It would be ideal to do this project in every building, but we are just looking to do these three at this time. This project would sit on top of the heating system and would not require us to replace our existing heating systems. These projects will show a 15% reduction in use.

A motion was made and seconded to forward to the full School Committee to move forward with the three energy source proposals for Attleboro High School, Brennan, and Wamsutta Schools in the heating retrofit projects. (3:0:0) Ms. Cook asked if there were any further discussion. Mr. DiCiaccio asked the expected savings. Mr. Furtado noted that the high school would show profit within the year, the middle school within a three year time frame, and noted National Grid is covering the costs. Vote: 6-0. Motion passes.

Vendor Contract Discussion: Mr. Stors recommended that this discussion be held off until January when the new School Committee comes in. Ms. Cook asked if the timing would be alright if this discussion was put off until January. Mr. Furtado stated that there are implications to the timing of releasing of the RFPs. Our job is to cover the fixed costs, and the more business you can secure early the better position you are in. In the past we have typically gone out late to leverage the aggressiveness of the bidding process. Ms. Cook stated that whenever Mr. Furtado feels it is appropriate we should go out to bid for the Food Service Contract. Mr. Furtado responded that the food service RFP is already drafted and can be given to the Committee at the December Meeting. The last contract that went out had the objective of the School Committee, which was to increase the nutritional value of the meals. We didn't pick the proposal that provided us with the greatest return. We picked the proposal with the better nutritional value. There is no downside to waiting a month or two. The only downside would be the potential of switching vendors as there is a cost when switching vendors. This cost can be small or very big. Mr. Furtado was not here when Laidlaw won the busing contract but that was a significant cost. This cannot be translated into contract dollars. Ms. Cook asked if it would be okay to wait until January to go out to bid for these contracts. It was noted that this could wait until January, February, or March to go out to bid for these contracts. If anything comes up in the meantime this item could be placed on the December Agenda, but for now we will table this discussion until January.

Capital Projects: Mr. Furtado was asked to follow up with Susan Hassan of BICO regarding the Finberg capital projects. He has

not been able to do so. These jobs will be placed on the Capital Improvements list so nothing further is needed.

User Fees: Mr. Furtado will meet with the Athletic Director to look at the process and see if it can be updated and streamlined.

The next meeting will be held on 12-16-11 @ 6:30 p.m.

### Policy Sub-Committee

The next meeting will be held on 11-22-11 @ 7:00 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James Stors,  
Secretary

Attachments:

1. Agenda dated 11-21-11
2. School Sponsored Events Power Point – 11-21-11
3. Proposal for Full-Day Kindergarten Power Point – 11-22-11
4. Memorandum – Report on Kindergarten Issues – 05-06-11
5. Whole School Improvement Plan – 2011-12 – Brennan Middle School
6. Whole School Improvement Plan – 2011-12 – Coelho Middle School
7. Whole School Improvement Plan – 2011-12 – Wamsutta Middle School
8. School Committee Personnel Report – 11-21-11
9. Draft Minutes – August 15, 2011
10. Warrant – 5AS018 – 11-09-11
11. Warrant – 5AS018 - - 11-16-11
12. MA DESE – Guidance on School Day and Structured Student Learning Time Requirements – 11-15-11
13. Grant Applications
14. Energy Source: Teknikor – AHS Energy Management Report
15. Energy Source: Teknikor – Wamsutta Middle School – Motor and Variable Frequency Drives Report
16. Energy Source: Horizons Solutions – Brennan Middle School – Motors and Variables Frequency Drives Report